

MARK R. THIERMAN, (State Bar No. 72913)
 LEON GREENBERG, (State Bar No. 226253)
 THIERMAN LAW FIRM
 7287 Lakeside Drive, Suite 101
 Reno, NV 89511
 Telephone: (775) 284-1500
 Facsimile: (775) 703-5027

****E-Filed 3/10/2011****

H. TIM HOFFMAN, (State Bar No. 49141)
 ARTHUR W. LAZEAR, (State Bar No. 83603)
 ROSS L. LIBENSON, (State Bar No. 181912)
 HOFFMAN & LAZEAR
 180 Grand Avenue, Suite 1550
 Oakland, CA 94612
 Telephone: (510) 763-5700
 Facsimile: (510) 835-1311

MAX FOLKENFLIK
 FOLKENFLIK & MCGERITY
 1500 Broadway, 21st Floor
 New York, NY 10036
 Telephone: (212) 757-0400
 Facsimile: (212) 757-2010

INTERIM LEAD COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

DAVID HO, on behalf of himself and others
 similarly situated and on behalf of the
 general public and DOES 1-20

Plaintiff,

v.

ERNST & YOUNG, LLP

Defendant.

Case No. CV 05-04867 JF (HRL)

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER EXTENDING THE PAGE LIMIT
 FOR PLAINTIFFS' REPLY
 MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
 MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

Caption continued on next page.

C 08-2853 JF (HRL)

JOSEPH LANDON individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERNST & YOUNG LLP, a limited liability
partnership; ERNST & YOUNG U.S. LLP, a
limited liability partnership; and DOES 1-
100, inclusive,

Defendant.

MICHELLE RICHARDS, on behalf 16 of
herself and all others similarly situated and
on behalf of the general public,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERNST & YOUNG LLP, and DOES - 50

Defendant.

C 08-4988 JF (HRL)

1 Plaintiffs Sarah Fernandez and Michelle Richards, and Defendant Ernst & Young LLP, by and
2 through their respective counsel, hereby agree and stipulate as follows:

3 **WHEREAS**, the parties' previously agreed, and the Court entered an Order, permitting the
4 parties to exceed the page limit for the Plaintiffs' Memorandum In Support of Class Certification and
5 Defendant's Memorandum In Opposition to Class Certification;

6 **WHEREAS**, Plaintiffs have requested a page extension of five (5) pages for its Reply
7 Memorandum, the parties have met and conferred and agreed that Plaintiffs may have twenty (20)
8 pages for their Reply Memorandum to Defendant's Opposition To Class Certification, the page limit
9 for Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum should be amended as follows:

- 10 1. Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum in support of their motion for class certification may be
11 twenty (20) pages in length.

12 Respectfully submitted,

13 Dated: March 8, 2011

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

14 By _____ /s/
15 Gregory W. Knopp
16 Attorneys for Defendant,
ERNST & YOUNG LLP

17 Dated: March 8, 2011

HOFFMAN & LAZEAR

18 By _____ /s/
19 Ross L. Libenson
20 Attorneys for Plaintiffs David Ho, Sarah Fernandez and
Michelle Richards

21 ///

22 ///

23 **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 Dated: March 10, 2010

25 By  _____
26 The Honorable J. Kent Fogel
JUDGE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT